

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-10 and 12-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 10, 12 and 16-22 stand rejected. Claim 3-9 and 13-15 were previously withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 10, 16-18 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sukegawa et al.** (US 2003/0039380, previously cited) in view of **Iisaka et al.** (USP 6,366,221, newly cited). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sukegawa et al.** in view of **Iisaka et al.** in further in view of **Hoshuyama et al.** (USP 6,906,744, previously cited). Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sukegawa et al.** in view of **Iisaka et al.** in further in view of **Shimazaki et al.** (US 2002/0198634, previously cited).

Initially, it is noted that independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify aspects of the present invention by making explicit that the object possesses a line pattern including lines, and that the guide determining unit determines that the object is not required to be guided, if the number of the lines included in the line pattern or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern, which is detected from an image of the object shot by said shooting unit, is larger than

the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information. Claims 20-22 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1.

As will be discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that neither **Sukegawa** nor **Iisaka**, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the following features of presently amended claim 1:

“the object possesses a line pattern including lines;
a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting unit is defined as the expected shooting state information; and

said guide determining unit determines that the object is not required to be guided, if the number of the lines included in the line pattern or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern, which is detected from the image of the object shot by said shooting unit, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information.” [Emphasis added.]

On page 4, lines 3-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner recognizes that **Sukegawa et al.** fails to disclose certain features recited in claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action recognizes:

Sukegawa et al. fails to disclose wherein: a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting unit is defined as the expected shooting state information; and said guide determining unit determines that the object is not required to be guided, if the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is detected from an image of the object shot by said shooting unit, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information.

The rejection relies on the **Iisaka et al.** reference to teach the above-noted features. However, it is respectfully submitted that **Iisaka et al.** does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features recited in claim 1.

More specifically, **Iisaka et al.** relates to a driver assistance system for generating a display image that is helpful for assisting a driver of a vehicle when parking in a parking space. In operation of the **Iisaka et al.** system, a camera 2 captures a frame of an image around a rear of the vehicle (col. 3, lines 37-47). Concurrently with the camera's image capturing, a rudder angle sensor 3 detects the angle of the steering wheel of the vehicle, i.e., a degree to which the steering wheel is turned (col. 3, lines 49-55). Based on the result received from the rudder angle sensor 3, an estimated path L is calculated and the estimated path L is displayed along with a vehicle model placed on the estimated path L (col. 3, lines 56-62). The object of displaying the vehicle model on the estimated path L is to help the driver easily determine whether his/her vehicle will bump against another vehicle if the driver keeps moving his/her vehicle with the current rudder angle on the estimated path L (col. 3, lines 60-65).

For example, column 4, lines 1-5 of **Iisaka** states:

Here, the vehicle model keeps moving by a predetermined quantity (hereinafter, referred to as a movement unit). When the movement quantity of the vehicle model reaches its predetermined maximum value, the vehicle model returns to its predetermined initial position.

However, **Iisaka** does not disclose or suggest that the object captured by the cameras 2 possesses a line pattern including lines (“the object possesses a line pattern including lines”). Further, **Iisaka** does not disclose or suggest that it is determined whether an object is not required to be guided based on the number of lines or the total length of lines included in a line pattern of an object shot by the cameras 2 (“the number of the lines included in the line pattern or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern”).

Unlike the claimed invention, the curved lines depicted in FIGS. 5A, 5B and 6 of **Iisaka** merely indicate movement units in the display image (i.e., a predetermined quantity by which the vehicle model is moved in the display image (see col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 5)), and the curved lines are not included in a line pattern possessed by the object. Hence, the movement quantity of the vehicle model of **Iisaka** has no relation to “the number of lines included in the line pattern or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern” presently recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that neither **Sukegawa** nor **Iisaka** disclose or suggest “wherein: the object possesses a line pattern including lines; a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting unit is defined as the expected shooting state information; and said guide determining unit determines that the object is not required to be guided, if the number of the lines included in the line pattern or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern, which is detected from an image of the object shot by said shooting unit, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the

expected shooting state information” as recited in claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that neither **Sukegawa** nor **Iisaka** disclose or suggest “shooting an object possessing a line pattern including lines with the shooting device,... wherein the expected shooting state information is defined as a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting device, and said determining further comprises determining that the object is not required to be guided if the number of the lines included in the line pattern or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern, which is detected from an image of the object shot by said shooting device, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information” as recited in claim 20 (and similarly in claim 21).

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that neither **Sukegawa** nor **Iisaka** disclose or suggest “wherein: the object possesses a line pattern including lines; a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting means is defined as the expected shooting state information; and said guide determining means determines that the object is not required to be guided, if the number of the lines included in the line pattern or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern, which is detected from the image of the object shot by said shooting means, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information” as recited in claim 22.

A rejection under §103 requires that the combination of reference teachings applied against the claims must disclose, or at least suggest, all claimed elements. In view of the

foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of **Sukegawa** and **Iisaka** does not disclose or suggest all elements recited in independent claims 1 and 20-22. Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 20-22, and claims dependent therefrom, are not obvious in view of the combination of **Sukegawa** and **Iisaka**. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 10, 16-18 and 20-22 under §103 are respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claims 12 and 19, it is submitted that neither **Hoshuyuma et al.** nor **Shimazaki et al.** alleviate any of the above-noted deficiencies of **Sukegawa et al.** and **Iisaka et al.** Accordingly, claims 12 and 19 respectively patentably distinguish over the combination of **Sukegawa et al.**, **Iisaka et al.** and **Hoshuyuma et al.** and the combination of **Sukegawa et al.**, **Iisaka et al.** and **Shimazaki et al.** for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependency thereon.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

Application No.: 10/784,776
Art Unit: 2622

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 042090

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/WILLIAM M. SCHERTLER/

William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/ar